

R E M A R K S

Claims 1-3, 5-10 and 23-25 are presented for reconsideration.

Applicants' attorneys wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesy of conducting telephone conferences in applicants' attempt to arrange a telephone interview. No interview was conducted, although the Examiner made helpful suggestions. It is noted that no agreements were reached.

In the **Final Rejection**, claims 23-25 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph; claims 1, 3, 5, 7 and 11 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Baumbach; claims 1, 3-5 and 7-11 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Grawey et al; claims 1-4, 8, 11 and 23-24 were rejected under 35 USC 102(a) on the U.S. Patent to Tamura et al; claims 6, 12-14 and 25 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over either Grawey et al or Tamura et al in view of applicants' admitted prior art.

By this amendment, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of dependent claim 4, which has been cancelled, and to further highlight the invention over the prior art by stating that the pressure is applied to the outer surface of the body of plastic material, which was previously mentioned in claim 11. Claim 9 has been amended to overcome possible indefiniteness. Claims 11-22 have been cancelled in view of the amendments to claim 1. Claim 23 has been amended to overcome the Examiner's rejection under 35 USC 112 and to highlight that the pressure is applied to an outer surface of the body, which is supported by previously-presented claim 24. Claim 25 has been amended to correct a possible indefinite portion.

It is respectfully requested that this amendment be entered for the purpose of placing the application in condition for allowance or, in the alternative, in better form for an appeal, since it does not raise any new issues, because the amendments to claim 1 are incorporating features of dependent claims, as is the amendment to claim 23, which overcomes the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Thus, for purposes of an appeal, the reduction in the number of claims and also of the rejections, such as the rejection

under 35 USC 112, would reduce the issues to be discussed on appeal. It is also submitted that no additional search is required.

As illustrated in the drawings, applicants form a body, such as 3, which has a hollow space which conforms to the outer surface of the component, inserts the component in this space, then applies pressure to the outer surface of the body 3 so as to secure the plastic body 3 on the component 1. As illustrated, the pressure indicated by the arrows P in Fig. 1 is preferably applied radially inward onto the component, such as from compression tools 8.

Baumbach discloses a communication circuit line protector and method of making the protector, wherein a voltage arrester 18 is inserted in a tubular element 27, which has been pressed on diametric sides to form a portion into an elliptical shape, as shown in Figs. 4 and 6. After the assembly of the arrester in the element 27, the entire device is encased in a protective module 2 comprising a plastic housing 4 and a base 6. Contrary to the Examiner's statements in the rejection of the claims, such as claims 1, 3, 5 and 7, there is no teaching or suggestion of joining the surfaces of the housing 4 on the voltage arrester 18, and there is no teaching or suggestion that the pressure applied on the sleeve, such as 27, causes it to be secured on the component. In addition, it is noted that there is no teaching or suggestion of the body being provided with an inside surface that is inverse in form to the surface of the component to be passivated. It is also noted that the rejection on Baumbach did not include claim 4, whose structure is not present in claim 1. Thus, it is submitted that claims 1, as amended, 3, 5 and 7 are clearly patentable over the teachings of Baumbach and are allowable.

With regard to the rejection of claims 1, 3-5 and 7-10 on Grawey et al, it is submitted that, contrary to the Examiner's statement, Grawey et al does not teach or suggest providing a body of plastic material for accommodating and encapsulating the surface of the component. In Grawey et al, the component, such as 102 (202), which is a piezoelectric solid state motor stack having terminals, such as 108, has a coating 220 of silicon elastomer injected on the device and after this, if this is not of sufficient thickness, then the device is dipped in more of the silicon elastomer until the desired thickness is reached. Then a silicon vacuum grease 222 is applied to the surface of the elastomer encapsulant 220 and, subsequently, a potting material, such as 224, is filled in the remaining space between the unit 202 and 204. There is no teaching or suggestion that the layers 220, 222 and 224 are a body


of plastic material and then the component, such as 202, is inserted into this body and subsequently joined by applying pressure to the body of the plastic material. It is submitted that this reference teaches coating by applying the liquid material and not by forming a body of plastic material having a space and then inserting the component in this hollow space. For these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 3, 5 and 7-10 are clearly not anticipated by Grawey et al and are not obvious in view of Grawey et al. Therefore, these claims are patentable over Grawey et al.

With regard to the rejection of claims 1-4, 8 and 23-24 as being anticipated by Tamura et al, it is submitted that Tamura et al is providing a seal structure for a component, such as an electrical conductor 2, as it passes through a hole 5 in a metal base 4. As disclosed, the component 2 with a plastic sleeve 3 is inserted in the opening 5 and then the material of the base member 4 is compressed axially along the component 2 to cause a deformation squeezing of the member 3 to form a seal between the member 3 and the component 2 as well as with the walls of the opening 5. It is submitted that since the base 4 is metal in Tamura et al, there is no teaching of applying pressure on the outer surface of the plastic body. With this knowledge, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not come upon the idea of externally exerting pressure on all of the outer surface of the cylindrical body 3. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 1, as amended, is clearly not anticipated or obvious in view of Tamura et al. It is also submitted that none of the references of record teach applying a radial pressure, since the pressure in Tamura et al is applied axially and acts on the tubular member 3 with a substantial axial component. Thus, it is submitted that the claims, such as dependent claims 24 and 25, are clearly allowable, since they recite that the pressure is created by a device acting on the outside surface of the body, which is not taught by Tamura et al. For these reasons, it is submitted that claims 1-4, 8 and 23-24 are clearly allowable over Tamura et al.

With regard to the rejection of the claims on either Tamura et al or Grawey et al in view of applicants' admitted prior art, whether or not applicants admit that there is a partially cross-linked plastic and that the pressure is generated by cross-linking of the plastic does not overcome the deficiencies with regard to Grawey et al and Tamura et al, as mentioned above, and, thus, it is submitted that the claims, such as 6 and 25, are clearly patentable over the combination applied in the Final Rejection and are allowable.

In view of the above amendments, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-3, 5-10 and 23-25 are allowable over the art of record and further reconsideration to that end is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



(Reg. No. 24,149)
James D. Hobart
SCHIFF HARDIN LLP
Patent Department
6600 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 258-5781
Customer Number: 26574

DATED: December 30, 2004

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on December 30, 2004.

James D. Hobart
Name of Applicants' Attorney



Signature

December 30, 2004
Date